HENOCH

SEMI-ANNUAL JOURNAL FOUNDED BY PAOLO SACCHI IN 1979

NEW SERIES 2005 – YEAR XXXI – N. 2/2009

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Gabriele Boccaccini (*University of Michigan, USA*); Claudio Gianotto (*University of Turin, Italy*); Corrado Martone (*University of Turin, Italy*); Paolo Sacchi (*emeritus, University of Turin, Italy*)

EDITOR IN CHIEF: Gabriele Boccaccini (*University of Michigan, USA*)
EDITOR IN CHARGE: Paolo Sacchi (*emeritus, University of Turin, Italy*)

PUBLISHING COMMISSION: Claudio Gianotto, Associate Editor (*University of Turin, Italy*); Marco Bertagna (*Morcelliana, Italy*); Pierpaolo Bertalotto (*University of Bari, Italy*); Todd Hanneken (*St. Mary's University, USA*); Ronald Ruark (*University of Michigan, USA*)
SECRETARY: Giovanni Ibba, (*Central Italy Theological Seminary, Florence, Italy*)

AMERICAN EDITORIAL BOARD: Kevin Sullivan (*Illinois Wesleyan University*), Associate Editor; Kelley Coblentz Bautch (*St. Edwards University, USA*); Charles Gieschen (*Concordia Theological Seminary, USA*); Philip Munoa (*Hope College, USA*); Laura Nasrallah (*Harvard Divinity School, USA*); Michael Satlow (*Brown University, USA*)
SECRETARY: James Waddell (*Unversity of Michigan, USA*) <waddellj@umich.edu>

FRENCH EDITORIAL BOARD: Katell Berthelot, Associate Editor (*CNRS, France*); Daniel Assefa (*Capuchin Franciscan Institute, Ethiopia*); Christophe Batsch (*University of Lille, France*); Tierry Legrand, News Editor (*University of Strasbourg, France*); Daniel Stoekl Ben Ezra, Book Review Editor (*CNRS, France*)
SECRETARY: Stephane Saulnier (*Newman Theological College, Canada*) <Stephane.F.Saulnier.2@nd.edu>
WEBSITE: perso.orange.fr/zwileg/henoch

GERMAN EDITORIAL BOARD: Matthias Henze, Associate Editor (*Rice University, USA*); Andreas Bedenbender (*Germany*); Carsten Claussen, News Editor (*University of Munich, Germany*); Ida Frohlich (*Catholic University Budapest, Hungary*); Gerbern Oegema (*McGill University, Canada*); Jan Dusek (*Protestant Theological Faculty Praha, Czech Republic*)
SECRETARY: Stefan Schorch (*Betel Theological College, Germany*) <sschorch@gmx.de>

ISRAELI EDITORIAL BOARD: Hanan Eshel, Associate Editor (*Bar-Ilan University, Israel*); Albert Baumgarten (*Bar-Ilan University Israel*); Gideon Bohak (*Tel-Aviv University, Israel*); Hillel Newman (*Haifa University, Israel*)
SECRETARY: Jonathan Ben-Dov (*Haifa University, Israel*) <jbendov@research.haifa.ac.il>

ITALIAN EDITORIAL BOARD: Corrado Martone, Associate Editor (*University of Turin, Italy*); Piero Capelli, News Editor (*University of Venice, Italy*); Claudio Gianotto (*University of Turin, Italy*); Giancarlo Lacerenza (*Naples Oriental Institute, Italy*); Silvia Castelli (*University of Trento, Italy*)
Eric Noffke, Book Review Editor (*Valdensian Faculty of Theology, Italy*)
SECRETARY: Luca Arcari (*"Federico II", University of Naples, Italy*) <lucaar@infinito.it >

SPANISH EDITORIAL BOARD: Pablo Torijano Morales, Associate Editor (*Complutense University of Madrid, Spain*); Fernando Bermelo Rubio (*University of Barcelona, Spain*); Adolfo Roitman (*Israel Museum Jerusalem, Israel*); Jaime Vazquez Allegue (*Pontifical University of Salamanca, Spain*); Carlos A. Segovia, Book Review Editor (*University of Seville, Spain*)
SECRETARY: Federico Colautti (*Redemptoris Mater Seminary Dever, USA*) <fd_colautti@mac.com>

BOOK REVIEWS EDITOR: Jason von Ehrenkrook (*University of Michigan, USA*)
NEWS EDITOR: Eric F. Mason (*Judson University, USA*)
IN MEMORIAM EDITOR: J. Harold Ellens (*University of Michigan, USA*)

Articles (in English, German, French, or Italian) should be submitted to the secretary of any Editorial Board

Periodicals Reading Room
401 Butler Library

CONTENTS / SOMMARIO

EDITORIAL / EDITORIALE

GABRIELE BOCCACCINI and RONALD RUARK, *4 Enoch: The Online Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism and Christian Origins* 243

THEME SECTION / SEZIONE MONOGRAFICA

Jacob Neusner and the Scholarship on Ancient Judaism (ed. Yaron Z. Eliav) 247

YARON Z. ELIAV, *Introduction* 247

DAVID GOODBLATT, *Neusner and the History of the Jews in the Land of Israel and Babyloniae* 248

STEVEN D. FRAADE, *Jacob Neusner as Reader of the Mishnah, Tosefta, and Halakhic Midrashim* 259

JUDITH HAUPTMAN, *Jacob Neusner's Methodological Contributions to the Study of Rabbinic Texts* 271

Papers from the 2008 Second Enoch Graduate Seminar at Princeton (ed. James H. Charlesworth, Martha Himmelfarb, and Gabriele Boccaccini) 284

ARIEL FELDMAN, *1Q19 ("Book of Noah") Reconsidered* 284

ERIC MILLER, *The* Self-Glorification Hymn *Reexamined* 307

BALÁZS TAMÁSI, *Prophesized History of the Postexilic Period and Polemics against Priests in 4Q390 from Qumran: Levite Authorship behind the Fragments?* 325

ESSAYS / SAGGI

RON H. FELDMAN, *The 364-Day "Qumran" Calendar and the Biblical Seventh-Day Sabbath: A Hypothesis Suggesting their Simultaneous Institutionalization by Nehemiah* 342

ERIC D. REYMOND, *Imaginary Texts in Pseudepigraphal Literature: The Angelic Hymns of Job's Daughters in* The Testament of Job 366

G.W. LOREIN and E. VAN STAALDUINE-SULMAN, *CšD II, 4 – IV, 9: A Song of David for Each Day* 387

between the Hebrew 1Q19 and the Aramaic 1 Enoch and Genesis Apocryphon testify to the fact that both Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish literatures of the Second Temple period drew from a common pool of exegetical traditions.

ABSTRACT

The fragmentary scroll 1Q19, dated to 30-1 B.C.E, was published by J.T. Milik in DJD 1. Two fragments of this scroll (frgs. 1-2) display an affinity to 1 En 7-9, reworking the story of the "sons of God" and the "daughters of men" from Gen 6:1-4. Another fragment (frg. 3) describes the miraculous birth of Noah. A similar reworking of Gen 5:28-29 is found in 1 En 106-107 and 1QapGen II-V. According to an influential theory, chapters 6-11 and 106-107 of the Book of Enoch originate in a work attributed to Noah, mentioned in several Second Temple sources. Given the similarity between 1Q19 1-3 and 1 En 7-9, 106-107, Milik assumed that it preserves the lost Book of Noah and published it as a "Livre de Noé."

Various aspects of 1Q19 were discussed by D. Dimant, J. Fitzmyer, K. Beyer, F. García Martínez, L. Stuckenbruck, and S. Bhayro. Yet, it appears that since its publication in 1955 this scroll has never been treated as a whole. Moreover, due to the editorial policy adopted in the first volumes of DJD, 1Q19 was published without a commentary. Given the progress that was made during the past fifty years in the field of Qumran studies in general, and in the study of the 1 Enoch and Genesis Apocryphon in particular, a detailed discussion of 1Q19 is long overdue. This paper provides a new edition of 1Q19, based on a fresh examination of the fragments and their photographs, followed by a commentary and a discussion of broader issues related to this scroll. This analysis sheds further light on the contents of 1Q19, as well as on its relation to 1 Enoch and Genesis Apocryphon.

THE *SELF-GLORIFICATION HYMN* REEXAMINED

ERIC MILLER, *Jewish Theological Seminary*

Now that the entire corpus of Qumran literature has been published, it is fitting to reexamine these texts, and the many scholarly conclusions proposed, from the perspective of the greater insight made possible by a comprehensive overview of the interrelationship among all the various Qumran texts and other Jewish literature of the period. As a case in point, this paper reviews the many attempts to identify the speaker in what is known as the *Self-Glorification Hymn*. Following this review, I will offer an alternative explanation, both regarding the identity of the speaker and the type of creative literary activity that lay behind its composition.

The Problem of Interpretation: Indeed, Who is Like Him?

As outlined by Esther Eshel, the text that she has labeled as the *Self-Glorification Hymn* is reflected in four separate witnesses within the Qumran corpus: 4Q471b, 4Q491, 4Q427, and 1QH^a XXV-XXVI.[1] Of all the editors of these varied texts for the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* series, Eshel provides us with the fullest comparative discussion in her assignment to review 4Q471b.[2] In her other articles on the subject she also provides us with the Hebrew text and translation of the three additional parallel texts, as well as a thorough review of the history of scholarly research on each of the four texts that she characterizes as versions of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*.[3]

---

[1] Eshel's *editio princeps* discussion of this material for the *DJD* series appears as"4Q471b: 4QSelf-Glorification Hymn (=4QH^e frg. 1?)" in *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XXIX, Qumran Cave 4 XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, edited by Bilhah Nitzan et al. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), pp. 421-432. Eshel also has an earlier review of the material, "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," in *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996), pp. 175-203, as well as a similar discussion, "The Identification of the 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 619-635.

[2] "4QSelf-Glorification Hymn," pp. 421-432.

[3] In addition to Eshel's discussions on this topic mentioned in footnote 2, for additional reviews of the interpretive history of these texts, see especially J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, *ABRL*, 1995), pp. 136-153; also, M.O. Wise, "מי כמוני באלים A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^A 25:35-26:10," in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7,2 (2000), pp. 173-219. For additional studies highlighting the linguistic comparisons of these texts, note E. Schuller, "A Hymn from a Cave Four Hodayot Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i + ii," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 112 (1993), pp. 605-628, and Schuller's "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description," in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 85 (1994), pp.

Although the details vary in the text of these four fragments, the thread that unites them all is the description of an individual who boasts of being stationed among the angels and yet has a glory superior to all the angels. From the perspective of the Hebrew Scriptures, one might characterize his attitude as startling, even audacious, demanding the question, who is here being described?

We will start our examination by quoting Eshel's translation and composite reconstruction of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, with 4Q471b as the base text, filled in by her comparison with the other parallel texts[4]:

1. [I am]recko[ned with the angels, my dwelling is in] the holy
2. [council.] Wh[o has been accounted despicable like me? And who] has been despised like m[e? And who]
3. has been shunned [by men] like me? [And who] compares to [me in enduring]evil? [No teaching]
4. compares to my teaching. [For]I sit [in heaven]
5. Who is like me among the angels? [Who would cut me off when I open my mouth? And] who
6. could measure [the flow] of my lips? Who[can associate with me in speech, and thus compare with my judgement? For I]
7. am the beloved of the King, a companion of the ho[ly ones, and no one can accompany me. And to my glory]
8. no one can compare, for I [have my station with the angels, and my glory with the sons of the King. Neither]
9. with gold will (I) cro[wn myself, nor with refined gold]
10. [ ] Sing,[O beloved ones

While a few expressions of our fragment seem to bear some resemblance to the humbler description of the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah 52:13-53:12, they are conflated with terminology that portrays a figure who is unparalleled among faithful servants of God.[5] In fact, the only previous examples of similar expression and terminology are found describing Biblical characters that were the paradigms of haughtiness and rebelliousness against God. For example, Isaiah 14:4-23 describes the

137-150; also J.J. Collins and D. Dimant, "A Thrice-Told Hymn: A Response to Eileen Schuller," pp. 151-155, and D. Dimant's "A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sources in 4Q427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B," also in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 85 (1994), pp. 157-161.

[4] Eshel, "4QSelf-Glorification Hymn," p. 431. In this discussion of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* I will use Eshel's reconstruction to demonstrate the main issues.

[5] This interspersing and reworking of texts from both positive and negative biblical contexts creates an underlying tension that will be discussed later. Regarding similar terminology between our text and the description of "the Suffering Servant," compare Isaiah 53:3, נבזה וחדל אישים, with lines 2 and 3 of our text (according to Eshel's reconstruction) מי נבזה כמוני ומי כמוני חדל אישים.

boasts of the king of Babylon who is said to have thought in his heart that he would climb to the sky and set his throne higher than the angels ("the stars of God"), and would even be like God. Because of his audacious pride the inhabitants of Sheol mock him as he is humiliated and brought low by God. The haughty expressions of the Babylonian king violate a fundamental scriptural principle outlined in Psalm 115:16: "The heavens belong to the LORD, but the earth He gave over to man."[6]

Similarly, Ezekiel 28:1-19 castigates the king of Tyre, who formerly had God's blessing – even being compared to a cherub residing on God's holy mountain. Yet, he boasted: "I am a god; I sit enthroned like a god," leading to his debasing punishment – being struck down by God. God's reproof is unequivocal: "you are not a god but a man, though you deemed your mind equal to a god's."[7] With such scriptural precedents, one might expect the boast in this Qumran text, מי כמוני באלים (literally, "who is like me among the gods"),[8] to be met with immediate divine reproof and retribution. Yet that does not occur. This places our hymn in a certain undeniable tension with biblical text, which would certainly not be lost on the biblically savvy Qumran community.[9]

Maurice Baillet was the first *DJD* editor to discuss one of these *Self-Glorification Hymn* fragments.[10] But by connecting it to the *War Scroll*, he

[6] All Hebrew Scripture quotes, unless otherwise noted, are taken from the *JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh: The Traditional Hebrew text and the New JPS translation* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1999). The tension created by the thought of a man entering the heavens – going beyond the bounds of the God-ordained region for his dwelling – is equal to that created by the violation of universal order by the angels ("the sons of God"), who, according to Genesis 6:1-4, left their heavenly abode to disobediently take "the daughters of men" as wives. This tension, as reflected in the Enoch tradition, will also be discussed.

[7] Ezekiel 28:2.

[8] Though I offer here a literal translation for emphasis in the context of the scriptures just referred to, Eshel's translation of אלים as "angels" is fully in harmony with the typical use of the term in Qumran literature. See M.J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 11, 1992), pp. 201-204. Note also Schuller's translation of this phrase in as it appears in 4Q427, "who (is) like me among the heavenly beings." See Schuller, "4Q427: 4QHodayot[a]," in *DJD XXIX*, p. 99. The fundamental affront to scriptural terminology in this statement becomes obvious when compared to the declaration regarding God himself at Exodus 15:11: מי כמכה באלם יהוה. On this Collins remarks: "The question of 4Q471b, 'who is like me among the gods?' implies a level of exaltation that is unparalleled in the Hodayot, echoing as it does Exod 15:11, 'who is like thee among the gods, O Lord?'" See Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, p. 138.

[9] Although Eshel does comment on the negative connotation of the tone of the speaker of this hymn, and even references Isaiah 14:13-15 in this regard, she does not pursue the issue of the underlying tension in adopting such language for a supposedly positive figure. See Eshel, "4QSelf-Glorification Hymn," pp. 422-423, footnote 9. See also, Eshel, "The 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn," pp. 628-629, and "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," p. 195.

[10] M. Baillet, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert VII, Qumran Grotte, 4, III (4Q482-4Q520)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 26-29.

misconstrued its context.[11] Baillet entitled fragment 4Q491 a "Canticle of Michael," and thus, by identifying the speaker as the archangel Michael, avoided the issue of human hubris. Morton Smith was quick to respond to Baillet's misidentification of the text, and persuasively argued that the speaker is a human figure who claims to have attained angelic status.[12] Smith notes the similarity in tone to statements in the *Thanksgiving Psalms* (*Hodayot*) at Qumran, and finally concludes that the speaker is a delusional member of the Qumran sect.[13]

Following up on Smith's view, and later, Martin Abegg's suggestion of linking 4Q491 to the *Hodayot*, Eileen Schuller examined 4Q427 (also called 4QH^a) in this light.[14] She did not offer definitive suggestions as to the speaker of the hymn; however, she raised the possibility of a separate origin (perhaps non-Qumranic?) for the hymns:

> I wonder if these hymns had a distinctive origin and usage and were secondarily joined with Hymns of the Teacher and perhaps other hymns to form the collection we know as 1QH^a. I suspect that 4QH^a will prove to be a most important, if puzzling, manuscript as it is studied further.[15]

Schuller and Eshel published their conclusions regarding 4Q427 and 4Q471b, respectively, in the same *DJD* volume, cross referencing each other's comments, and agreeing upon the parallel nature of these texts.[16] In this volume, as in her other articles on the subject, Eshel came to the conclusion that the speaker of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* fits the image of the eschatological high priest referred to in other Qumran texts:

[11] For a very persuasive presentation of evidence refuting any association of these fragments with the War Scoll, see M. Abegg, "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?" in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, J.C. Reeves ad J. Kampen, eds. (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 184, 1994), pp. 136-147. Eshel later agreed with this assessment. See Eshel, "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," pp. 175-176.

[12] See M. Smith, "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, L. Shiffman, ed., (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 8, 1990), pp. 181-188; also, "Two Ascended to Heaven – Jesus and the Author of 4Q491," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, James H.Charlesworth, ed. (New York: Doubleday, *ABRL*, 1992), pp. 290-301. In reviewing the history of this interpretation, Wise clarifies the time frame; Baillet's *DJD* volume coming out in 1982, and Smith's refutation first offered at a conference in 1985. See Wise, "A Study of 4Q491c ," pp. 173-175.

[13] Smith's personal views are certainly transparent as he refers to the author of this hymn as both an "egomaniac" and a "preposterous poet with an exaggerated notion of his own sanctity." "Two Ascended to Heaven," pp. 295-299.

[14] Abegg, "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?," pp. 137-138; see also Wise, "A Study of 4Q491c ," pp. 175-176.

[15] Schuller, "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts," pp. 149-150.

[16] Schuller, "4Q427: 4QHodayot^a," pp. 96-108; Eshel, "4QSelf-Glorification Hymn," pp. 421-432.

> In the priestly blessing (1QSb) is a description of the eschatological high priest, a descendent of Aaron who comes at the End of Days. The elevated status of the 'speaker' is emphasized: he is sitting with the angels in the heavenly temple, taking part in the angelic ceremonies. In addition, his teaching is described as a light which illuminates the world with knowledge. This description resembles that of the 'speaker' in the Self-Glorification Hymn. The hymn was spoken in the name of the eschatological high priest.[17]

In taking a stand on this identification of the speaker in the text, Eshel is careful to highlight that, although there are many seeming parallels, she does not identify this eschatological high priest with the historical figure so prominent in other Qumran texts – the Teacher of Righteousness – though she allows for the option that some later members of the Qumran sect may have eventually made just such a connection in their efforts to cope with the death of this charismatic Teacher.[18]

Writing shortly before Eshel, John Collins also reviewed the relationship between these various Self-Glorification texts, and similarly posited that "the best candidate for identification with the exalted speaker of this hymn is the one who would 'teach righteousness at the end of days,'" whom he also identifies as the eschatological High Priest of other Qumran texts.[19] Both Eshel and Collins emphasize that, although the author is a human who describes himself as enthroned in the heavens, there is no description or terminology of ascents.[20] This contrasts with Morton Smith, who envisioned the author of this hymn as an influential Qumran teacher who saw himself in a situation of ecstatic visionary Enoch-like ascent to heaven.[21]

Abegg is less definitive than Eshel and Collins in rejecting the Teacher of Righteousness as the subject, or even the actual author, of these texts. He

[17] Eshel, "4QSelf-Glorification Hymn," p. 426.

[18] Ibid., pp. 424-427. It is interesting to note Michael O. Wise's variation on this conclusion. Wise sees the subject of the hymn as the Teacher of Righteousness, but emphasizes the sociological and psychological behavior of the Qumran community, singing this hymn about their charismatic Teacher as a coping mechanism following his death. His ascent to the status of an angelic figure refers, in Wise's view, to glorification after death. Each individual Qumran member that chanted the hymn was then foreshadowing his own eventual glorification to angelic status after death, this walking fully in the footsteps of their master right up into the heavens. See Wise, "A Study of 4Q491c," pp. 216-219.

[19] Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, p. 148. See also Eshel, "The 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn," pp. 619-635. It is worth noting here C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis' interesting critique of Collins and Eshel's identification of the speaker of the hymn as an eschatological figure. See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea* Scrolls (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 204-216.

[20] Eshel, "4QSelf-Glorification Hymn," p. 424; "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," pp. 194-202; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, pp. 136-153.

[21] Again, see Smith "Two Ascended to Heaven," pp. 297-299.

emphasizes that "the intensely personal tone of the *Thanksgiving Hymns* stands in sharp contrast to the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls."[22] Regarding the speaker in our texts, he sums up:

> Whatever we conclude about the original setting of the statements in manuscript III of 4Q491, it appears clear that the answer to our quest for the identity of the implied speaker of this text and of 4Q427 rises and falls with our judgment concerning the author of the Thanksgiving Hymns. Although we cannot be absolutely certain of the speaker's identity, the Teacher of Righteousness, the acknowledged founder of the Qumran Community, is a strong candidate.
> Such an identification of the implied speaker does not necessarily mean that the historical Teacher of Righteousness actually claimed to have ascended to heaven and taken a place among the gods. The teacher of Righteousness might have made such a claim, but it is also possible that such a claim was made *on behalf of* the Teacher of Righteousness by the author(s) of the texts we have examined.[23]

Abegg's conclusion returns in large measure to the position of Morton Smith. While allowing for the possibility of the postmortem composition, or co-opting, of this hymn for the Teacher of Righteousness, he gives equal weight to the idea of the hymn being authored by this central Qumran figure. Abegg also ignores the distinction that Collins and Eshel make regarding the lack of ascent terminology, and in both the title and conclusion of his article describes the author's experience as an ascent.

Israel Knohl not only proposes that this was the hymn of a teacher important to Qumran, but even seeks to identify him with a specific historic figure of the first century B.C.E. named Menahem the Essene.[24] Knohl presents Menahem as a self-styled Messiah, rejected by Jews outside of Qumran and eventually killed; the *Self-Glorification Hymn* reflected his "messianic secret" of attaining quasi-divine status.[25]

[22] Abegg, "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness," in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint, eds. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1997), p. 71.

[23] Ibid., p. 72.

[24] Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

[25] Ibid., pp. 58-68. Knohl presents and interconnects a fascinating array of sources: Hebrew scripture texts, Qumran writings, Josephus, New Testament, Mishnah, as well as non-Jewish texts. The virtuosity of his presentation is impressive, but his casual connecting of texts from so many different time periods and contexts is quite untenable. Wise also attempted to suggest an historical figure – for whom he proposes the name Judah – as the subject of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*. Wise later expands upon his concept (see footnote 18) of the hymn being applied by Judah's disciples at Qumran to the semi-divine status that their teacher has attained following his death. See Wise, *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior Before Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999). For an analysis which discusses the weaknesses in both of these interpretations, see J. VanderKam and P. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002), pp. 268-273.

Our review of the attempts over the last couple of decades to identify the speaker in the *Self-Glorification Hymn* has run the gamut from an archangel in the heavens, to a future eschatological figure of central importance, to a specific historical figure at Qumran. But have we arrived at the core issue that could shed light on the bold assertions uttered by the speaker of this hymn? Does this hymn reflect either the expressions or perceptions of an actual person?

The Problem of Context, "Explicit" Content, and the Question of Mystical Practice

Since the *Self-Glorification Hymn* was identified as part of the *Hodayot*, our fragments were placed squarely within the framework of Qumran poetical and liturgical texts. Qumran scholarship has in recent years endeavored to understand the function of such texts within the Qumran community.[26] On this topic, Eileen Schuller writes:

> One of the essential tasks of the heavenly angels is to sing the divine praises in songs and hymns... Thus, to the extent that both individuals and the community as a whole understood themselves to be 'angel-like,' song and praise, particularly in poetic form, could be expected to play a central role in their worship.[27]

Among some scholars researching the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, a view developed that "the repetitious, almost hypnotic language may have served to produce a kind of 'communal mysticism,' that is, to allow the reciters to experience, through the medium of words, some sense of participating in the heavenly cult."[28] This concept of viewing Qumran as an

[26] See for example, E. Chazon, "Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*, D.K. Falk, F. Garcia Martinez and E. M. Schuller, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 95-105; B. Nitzan, "The Idea of Holiness in Qumran Poetry and Liturgy," also in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, pp. 127-145; and D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[27] Schuller, "Some Reflections on the Functions and Use of Poetical Texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center For the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19-23 January 2000*, E.G. Chazon, ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 189.

[28] Schuller, "Worship, Temple, and Prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Volume Three* (Part Five, The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Section One: Theory of Israel) J. Neusner, A.J. Avery-Peck, and B.

"angel-like" community has led to further speculation regarding the *Self-Glorification Hymn*. Speaking specifically about this text, Esther Chazon concludes:

> This station with the angels who praise God, as well as the speaker's gifted speech... imply that the speaker [in the Self-Glorification Hymn], too, praises God, and that he does so together with the angels and on a par with them. This text leaves little doubt about the speaker's elevation to angelic status.
> ...It is not impossible that the speaker, whether the Teacher of Righteousness or a similarly exalted leader of the *Yahad*, projected his own spiritual, perhaps even mystical, experience onto all members of his community or conversely, that the *Yahad* projected onto itself the Teacher's achievements and experiences.[29]

Recently, Philip Alexander has referred to these Self-Glorification texts as a key piece of the puzzle in developing his argument that the Qumran community was a site of early Jewish mystic practice.[30] Alexander's study is the most ambitious to date involving an attempt to offer a theoretical framework connecting Qumran texts and practice with the later forms of Jewish *Merkavah* and *Hekhalot* Mysticism.

But there have been dissenting voices to the view that Qumran liturgical texts represent mystical praxis.[31] Elliot Wolfson objected early on to Bilhah Nitzan's claim that the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* found at Qumran were "a medium for creating an experience of mystic communion between earthly and heavenly worshippers."[32] Wolfson explains that part of his objection lies in the lack of clear definition of the term "mysticism."

> In my opinion, the word "mysticism" should be used only when there is evidence for specific practices that lead to an experience of ontic

Chilton, eds. (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2001), p. 138. For a balanced overview of issues related to the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, see Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 126-149.

[29] Chazon, "Human and Angelic Prayer in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Liturgical Perspectives*, p. 45.

[30] P. Alexander, *Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* (London: T & T Clark, 2006); note especially pp. 85-92.

[31] The conclusion of Collins, and others mentioned earlier, who view these Self-Glorification texts as fulfilled in the eschatological high priest does not lead to a mystical interpretation. However, in a different context Collins writes: "The Dead Sea Scrolls will provide further evidence that the mystical participation in the heavenly world could function as an alternative to the temple cult, when that was deemed unsatisfactory." Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984; 1998 edition), p. 54.

[32] See Nitzan, "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran," in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994), p. 183.

> transformation, i.e., becoming divine or angelic. Accordingly, it is inappropriate to apply the word "mystical" to the unison or harmony of human and angel if there is no technique or praxis that facilitates the idealization of a human being into a divine or angelic being in the celestial abode.[33]

But, after rejecting Nitzan's examples as evidence of mystic experience at Qumran, Wolfson continues:

> Interestingly enough, however, there is one Qumran fragment – col. 1 of 4Q491 – which according to the reconstruction of Morton Smith does in fact relate the ascension and enthronement of a select individual of the sect... If the reconstruction and interpretation of Smith be accepted, then we have a text that should be labeled "mystical" in the technical sense that I have described above.[34]

So while objecting to the general characterization of Qumran literature as mystical, Wolfson accepts the *Self-Glorification Hymn* as a possible early representation of a Jewish mystical tradition. Once again, Morton Smith's view of this hymn as representing an ecstatic vision of heavenly ascent comes to the fore.

Alexander is obviously unconvinced by Wolfson's arguments, as he expands upon the idea that the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* together with the *Self-Glorification Hymn* provide persuasive evidence of full-blown mystic tradition and practice at Qumran.

> The analysis of the ascent-to-heaven traditions at Qumran carries our argument forward quite a long way. It suggests that there was an active practice of ascent within the Qumran community. Ascent was not just something done by certain spiritual superheroes in the past (though their

[33] E.R. Wolfson, "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions From Qumran: A Response to Bilhah Nitzan," in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994), p. 187. Wolfson's definition of mysticism draws its inspiration from Gershom Scholem's worldview. For an alternate approach to defining what lies behind so-called mystic texts, see Peter Schafer, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992).

[34] Wolfson, "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions From Qumran," pp. 200-201. So, Wolfson does not reject the idea of mystic speculation at Qumran. In fact, he concludes that "chariot speculation was an essential aspect of the religious worldview of the Qumran sect" (Ibid., p. 201). But he demands that a distinction be made between mystic speculation and Midrash and mystic practice. For a prior discussion on a text from the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* as early evidence of *Merkavah* speculation, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Merkavah Speculation at Qumran: The 4Q Serekh Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat," in *Mystics, Philosophers, and Politicians: Essays in Jewish Intellectual History in Honor of Alexander Altmann*, Jehuda Reinharz and Daniel Swetschinski, eds. (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1982), pp. 15-47.

example was important in showing it was possible), but something that could still be achieved here and now. The Self-Glorification Hymn fizzes with real experience: it is surely not all a matter of literary convention and literary fantasy. The ascension in the Self-Glorification Hymn is not just a case of celestial tourism, viewing the wonders of heaven, and receiving a prophetic and/or priestly commission. It involves transformation – angelification, possibly even apotheosis. The ascender takes his seat in heaven above the angels. This is a classic component of mysticism: the ultimate goal of mystical experience is communion or union with the divine. And he is in some sense a forerunner, or trailblazer, who can lead his community into a closer communion with heaven. All this can easily be integrated with the Sabbath Songs, and can help us construct for them a possible liturgical scenario. The Maskil boasts of his ascent to heaven, he calls upon his community to praise God and leads them in the performance of highly charged and emotive songs which describe the angelic liturgy.[35]

As we have seen in a number of cases, there is no lack of creative imagination at work in constructing possible scenarios that account for the unusual characteristics of these Qumran texts. Nor is there any lack of scholarly expressions of certitude in these matters. But I would like to suggest a return to a stance of greater humility – a healthy degree of uncertainty – in a call to search out new paradigms and explore the issues anew following the publication of all the Qumran texts.

One such note of caution regarding Qumran texts comes from Carol Newsom, who published a seminal edition of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.[36] In her initial study she considered these texts as representative of the Qumran sect. However, upon further analysis she concluded that there was nothing specifically sectarian in the texts themselves, but rather:

> The most plausible explanation seems to be that the Sabbath Songs alone originated outside of and probably prior to the emergence of the Qumran community. Appropriated by the Qumran sect, this document became an important text in the community for the reasons that I have discussed in my edition of the Sabbath Songs.[37]

[35] Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, pp. 90-91.

[36] C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1985).

[37] Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters*, W.H.Propp, B. Halpern and D.N. Freedman, eds. (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), p. 184. In this important study Newsom highlights the difficulties of determining which texts were actually authored by the Qumran sect as opposed to those that were co-opted by them.

Many scholars who have given close attention to the *Self-Glorification Hymn* have commented on its seemingly unique nature, somehow going beyond what other Qumran texts allow. Note Collins' conclusions as he attempts to reconstruct the literary development of three of the four fragments in our discussion:

> All three fragments attest the notion of fellowship with the angels. This notion was already familiar from the Hodayot. The most intriguing aspect of 4Q491 11, however, is not paralleled in either 4Q427 or 4Q471b. This is the mention of "a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods" and the claim to have "taken a seat" in the heavens, presumably on the throne. We cannot be sure whether these boasts were also part of Q427 and 4Q471, but the question in 4Q471b, "who is like me among the gods?" implies a level of exaltation that is unparalleled in the Hodayot, echoing as it does Exod 15:11, "who is like thee among the gods, O Lord?" Since this boast is more likely to have been added in 4Q471b than omitted in 4Q491, we may suggest that 4Q491 preserves the older form of the text, and that the throne in heaven was an original element in the composition, but this suggestion is obviously very tentative.[38]

Earlier I quoted Schuller raising the possibility that 4Q427 was not originally part of the *Hodayot* collection, but might have had other origins and been joined with the *Hymns of the Teacher* to the *Hodayot*.[39] Following up on this possibility and the conclusions of Newson regarding the difficulty of determining that a text found at Qumran necessarily originated at Qumran, we could pursue the implications of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* having pre-Qumranic origins.

The Self-Glorification Hymn *and the* Book of Parables

Perhaps this text stands out as so different from other Qumran texts for the simple reason that it does not reflect an internal development within the thought of Qumran, but rather, a less than seamless attempt to integrate a non-Qumranic tradition into the Qumran liturgy. If this were the case, all the previous suggestions to tie it to different Qumran concepts, doctrines and settings become far less relevant.[40]

[38] Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, pp. 138-139.

[39] Schuller, "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts," pp. 149-150.

[40] This does not negate a Qumran authorship to the texts under discussion, but rather an incorporation of earlier traditions which are unrelated to Qumran worship.

Pursuing this possibility further, and returning to the question of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* as an ascent text, James Davila's comments are of particular interest.[41] After quoting our fragment in 4Q491 he states:

> The words of this writer are quite extravagant – more reminiscent of the transformation of Enoch into an angel in the much later book of *3 Enoch* than the patriarch's more restrained tours of heaven and visions in *1 Enoch*. The language is also very direct; there is no temptation to dismiss what is claimed as metaphor by the writer, who speaks in the first person. He appears to have a throne of his own in heaven, unlike any of the kings of old, and numbers himself among the gods (i.e. the angels). What this text describes is not just an ascent, but an apotheosis.[42]

The natural home for what is described in the text seems to be in harmony with what is known of later developments in the Enoch tradition.

The question of Enoch texts at Qumran is complex. Most scholars agree that *1 Enoch* is actually made up of five separate books, each with its own manuscript history. [43] Fragments from four of these books, which predated the formation of the Qumran community are represented among the Qumran scrolls.[44] The Enoch section missing from Qumran, the *Book of Parables*, or, *Similitudes of Enoch*, is considered a later work, perhaps from the later part of the first century B.C.E, or the first century C.E.[45] Gabriele Boccaccini has spearheaded a hypothesis that there was a movement within Second Temple Judaism that could be termed "Enochic Judaism." According to this theory, this later section of *1 Enoch*, the *Book of Parables*, is deliberately excluded from Qumran because the teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness were rejected by the greater Enoch movement. Thereafter, according to Boccaccini, Qumran separated itself, and set out on a trajectory opposed to the rest of Enochic Judaism and these later Enoch texts.[46]

---

[41] J.R. Davila, "Heavenly Ascents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), Volume 2, pp. 461-485.

[42] Ibid., p. 475.

[43] See G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), "Introduction," pp. 1-125; also G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), "Introduction," pp. 1-17.

[44] Nickelsburg, "Introduction," p. 9.

[45] Ibid., p. 7. For an extended debate on this subject, see *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, edited by Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007), "Part Six: The Dating," pp. 413-496.

[46] See Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998). This theory is hotly debated; for opposing considerations by numerous scholars in the field see *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, edited by Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2005); also *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.

However, Devorah Dimant has recently published a persuasive article arguing that the *Book of Parables* displays a close affinity with both Qumranic thought and terminology, and would have been produced by circles within Judaism that were not in any striking opposition to the Qumran community, and may have even drawn ideas from Qumran texts.[47]

The relevance of this possibility for our study lies in the fact that it is particularly in the *Book of Parables* (*1 Enoch* 37-71) that we find expressions with close conceptual links to the *Self-Glorification Hymn*. For example, in the *Book of Parables* Enoch sees "the son of man," God's "Chosen One," sitting on the throne of glory:

> On that day, my Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory and he will test their works. [48]

> And the Chosen One, in those days, will sit upon my throne, and all the secrets of wisdom will go forth from the counsel of his mouth, for the Lord of Spirits has given (them) to him and glorified him.[49]

These expressions parallel the imagery of the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, describing its unique speaker, the "beloved of the King," (4Q471b) who declares that he sits on "a mighty throne in the angelic council" (4Q491[c]).[50]

The fact that the enthroned "Chosen One," the "son of man," in *1 Enoch* is also granted "all the secrets of wisdom" which then "go forth from the counsel of his mouth" is a theme highlighted throughout the *Book of Parables*, and also closely tied to the authority granted to him to judge both mighty ones and kings:

> There I saw one who had a head of days, and his head was white like wool. And with him was another, whose face was like the appearance of a man; and his face was like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel of peace, who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, about that son of man – who he was and whence he was (and) why he went with the Head of Days. And he answered me and said to me, "This is the son of man who has righteousness and righteousness dwells with him. And all the treasures of what is hidden he will reveal; for the Lord

---

[47] See D. Dimant, "The *Book of Parables* (*1 Enoch* 37-71) and the Qumran Scrolls," [Hebrew] in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls III* (Jerusalem and Haifa: The Bialik Institute and Haifa University, 2005), pp. 49-67.

[48] *1 Enoch* 45:3. All *1 Enoch* quotes taken from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*.

[49] *1 Enoch* 51:3. Compare also *1 Enoch* 61:8; 62:2-9; 69:29.

[50] Quotes here from the *Self-Glorification Hymn* fragments are taken from Eshel, "The Identification of the 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn," pp. 620-625.

> of Spirits has chosen him, and his lot has prevailed through truth in the presence of the Lord of Spirits forever. And this son of man whom you have seen – he will raise the kings and the mighty from their couches, and the strong from their thrones. He will loosen the reins of the strong, and he will crush the teeth of sinners. He will overturn the kings from their thrones and their kingdoms, because they do not exalt or praise him, or humbly acknowledge whence the kingdom was given to them."[51]

> For he is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness; and unrighteousness will vanish like a shadow, and will have no place to stand. For the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence of the Lord of Spirits; and his glory is forever and ever, and his might, to all generations. And in him dwell the spirit of wisdom and the spirit of insight, and the spirit of instruction and might, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness. And he will judge the things that are secret, and a lying word none will be able to speak in his presence; For he is the Chosen One in the presence of the Lord of Spirits according to his good pleasure.[52]

The speaker of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* senses a similar exalted gift of wisdom and unparalleled ability in judgment:

> Who could cut off my words? And who and who shall measure the flow of my speech? Who can associate with me and thus compare with my judgment?[53]

In the *Book of Parables* Enoch is repeatedly overwhelmed by these visions during his heavenly tour. But he is particularly interested to discover the identity of this unique figure, the "Chosen One," the "son of man," who attains the incomparable exaltation to be seated on a throne in God's presence, and blessed with the secrets of unparalleled wisdom and judgment. The identity of this one remains unclear until the final chapter of the *Book of Parables*:

> And he took my spirit – even me, Enoch – to the heaven of the heavens, and I saw there, as it were, a house built of hailstones, and between the stones were tongues of living fire.[54]

[51] *1 Enoch* 46:1-5.
[52] *1 Enoch* 49:1-4.
[53] 4Q491[c].
[54] *1 Enoch* 71:5.

> And out of that house came Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel and many holy angels without number. And with them was the Head of Days, and his head was white and pure as wool, and his apparel was indescribable. And I fell on my face, and all my flesh melted, and my spirit was transformed. And I cried out with a loud voice, with a spirit of power, and I blessed and praised and exalted. And those blessings that went forth from my mouth were acceptable in the sight of the Head of Days.[55]

Only at this point it is revealed to Enoch that he himself is that Chosen One, that son of man that he has repeatedly seen in vision[56]:

> And the angel came to me and greeted me with his voice and said to me, "You are that son of man who was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you." And he said to me, "He proclaims peace to you in the name of the age that is to be, for from there peace has proceeded from the creation of the age, and thus you will have it forever and ever. And all will walk in your path since righteousness will never forsake you; with you will be their dwelling and with you their lot, and from you they will not be separated forever and forever and ever. And thus there will be length of days with that son of man, and there will be peace for the righteous, in the name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever."[57]

How would we picture Enoch reacting at this dramatic moment? What would his emotions have been at the instant that the angel declares to him that he himself, despite having been a lowly man on earth, is this exalted figure that is destined to be so special in God's eyes that he will sit on a throne in heaven and judge the mighty and the kings of the earth, and bestow righteousness and peace to mankind? Could this event provide the background for a spontaneous hymn of exultation? Could imagining such a moment of realization lead to the composition of a hymn like the *Self-Glorification Hymn*?

The earlier sections of *1 Enoch*, such as the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1-36), offer an exegesis of portions of Genesis, chapters 5 and 6, that speak of faithful Enoch being 'taken' by God, followed by the story of 'the sons of God,' the angels who sinned by leaving their place in the heavens and taking 'the daughters of men' as wives prior to the flood. *1 Enoch* 14

[55] *1 Enoch* 71:9-12.
[56] VanderKam discusses the rationale behind the figure of Enoch seeing the 'son of man' in vision, but later being told that he is in fact that one. See "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, J.H. Charlesworth, ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 169-191. See also related discussions in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
[57] *1 Enoch* 71:14-17.

stands out as a striking vision of Enoch's ascent to heaven, in which the author artfully plays with the imagery from the chariot visions of Ezekiel.[58]

Based on this pattern, I propose that certain elite literate circles of Jews during the Hellenistic and Roman periods that held a special interest in the figure of Enoch, were not content to have only this description of Enoch's ascent. They continued in a creative literary and imaginative exploration of the possibilities of relating other biblical texts – perhaps even those viewed as messianic allusions – to their ancient hero.[59] The *Book of Parables* quoted above displays the results of some of these explorations. Prominent in these quotes are allusions to Daniel 7 and Psalm 2, both rich in what came to be perceived of as messianic promises. The figure of 'the son of man' appearing in heaven before the throne of the "Ancient of Days" in Daniel 7:13 is clearly in play, albeit somewhat altered as "the Head of Days." The *Book of Parables* examines the possibility of linking this unique figure with that of Enoch himself; a logical step, since *1 Enoch* 14 already placed him before God's throne.

Such traditions, eventually gathered together in books like *1 Enoch*, were likely only a portion of similar creative imaginings. Others are probably lost to history, as were the Qumran writings themselves until the last century. I am not proposing that the Qumran community was in possession of the *Book of Parables*, but rather that they, and groups like them, may well have been familiar with comparable literary and oral traditions – these creative interplays between Bible text and imaginative Enochic investigations – that eventually made up this book.

The tradition that was finally penned as the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, reflected in its various versions at Qumran, could originally have been one such poetic excursus – an interplay between Isaiah 53 and further details of Enochic imaginings concerning his glorification following his ascent. One possible scenario would be to picture an author in an Enochic circle musing over traditions similar to those we quoted from the *Book of Parables*. He could have thought to himself, how would Enoch respond upon realization that he had become a glorified 'son of man' (later pictured in Daniel 7)? What if he were not only standing before God's throne, but given a throne by God? Would he not cry out in delight: "Who is like me among the godlike ones"? A poem such as the *Self-Glorification Hymn* could easily have been authored following such meditations.[60]

[58] See Nickelsburg, *Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*, pp. 257-266.

[59] The way I am envisioning this activity follows the general conclusions of Martha Himmelfarb in *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 95-114. The literary allusions and interplay seem to me to dominate these texts much more than any description of actual experience. That being said, I do not totally discount the possibility of some degree of mystic speculation in the circles producing these texts, though I find little evidence for so-called mystic practice.

[60] If so, it would follow the biblical formula of a prayer of exultation in response to a new and blessed situation, such as Hannah's prayer in Judges 2:1-10, or many similar Psalms of

My suggestions above are by no means an emphatic assertion of a new and more accurate conceptualization of history. Rather, they are an effort to reexamine the subject of a specific Qumran text by taking a step back, reconsidering whether directions taken, and explanations given in the last few decades of research, still satisfy, now that we have all the material before us. Eshel and Collins, who reject any connection of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* with a personal ascent experience, raise valid arguments. However, why imagine inventing a hymn of such unparalleled boasting for an eschatological high priest whose time has not yet come – and whose identity is quite uncertain – when the Qumran community already was well familiar with the truly unique and beloved biblical figure that had the glorious experience of being taken by God to the heavens?[61]

As mentioned much earlier, there is an underlying tension in the very thought that a man would ascend to heaven. From a scriptural perspective, this blurring of boundaries between heaven and earth is unhealthy, unnatural. It is the reverse of the very sin of the Watchers – the angels who came to earth before the flood to have intercourse with women. To highlight this tension, the author of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* employs phraseology that is taken from negative scriptural contexts, and juxtaposes it against positive contexts of messianic import. I see this as a deliberate literary device, strengthening the argument that we are observing the creation of literature which skillfully reflects the theological tensions felt by the author, rather than expressing personal mystic experience. This literary aspect of our Qumran text, and the literary devices employed, raises an issue that deserves further study in other texts.[62]

David. My conclusions here are not directed to the question of mystic practice in Qumran (though I suspect it may have far less basis than Alexander and others propose). If the *Self-Glorification Hymn* did not originate at Qumran, but was merely appropriated by the community, its employment by the Qumran sectarians could still have a history of its own. In this regard, I appreciate Davila's balanced comments on methodological considerations in "Heavenly Ascents," pp. 480-483.

[61] In my mind, the exceptional first-person approach in this hymn is also better suited to a well-known figure, rather than a prophetic, anonymous entity, whose personality would be an enigma to the readers.

[62] Within the context of imaginative exploration of a literary theme, the later development of the full-fledged transformation of Enoch into an angel, in *2 Enoch* (*2 Enoch* 9:15-19), and even more explicitly in *3 Enoch*, where Enoch becomes the angel Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence (*3 Enoch* 3:1-4:10), continues to reflect this tension. The theological fears and concerns raised by a human actually becoming an angel, a godlike one, and the theological confusion caused by such a transformation, along with his heavenly enthronement, may partially explain the insertion of discordant passages into *3 Enoch*, in which Enoch, the Metatron, was whipped with sixty lashes, when through no fault of his own, he was confused by a human to be a power in heaven equal to God (*3 Enoch* 16:1-5). Certainly there is much more that can be said about these passages, as well as comparisons between *3 Enoch* and rabbinic literature, but their history is of a later period that is far beyond the purview of our present discussion.

The *Self-Glorification Hymn* has always posed difficulties for Qumran scholars. Explaining it requires approaching the text fully armed with corresponding conceptualizations about both the community and the practices at Qumran. This discussion offers some suggestions of approach that could help revise our underlying assumptions regarding this text – viewing the text as a creative literary excursus, rather than a personal mystic experience, or a prophetic picture of an eschatological figure. Whether or not the suggestions seem tenable, whether or not the *Self-Glorification Hymn* derives from an earlier "Hymn of Enoch," my hope is that this analysis will spur the reader on to make a reexamination of the solidity of their own premises when approaching such works. Then, even if we are studying ascents into the heavens, we can do so with both feet firmly planted on the ground.

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the many attempts by various scholars to identify the speaker in what is known as the Self-Glorification Hymn *from the Qumran corpus (4Q471b, 4Q491, 4Q427, and 1QH[a] XXV-XXVI). After reviewing the difficulties posed by the various theories, it offers the possibility of understanding the* Self-Glorification Hymn *as a "Hymn of Enoch" not originating in Qumran. The paper raises the possibility of this hymn constituting a form of creative literary meditation – a poetic excursus reflecting traditions within ancient Judaism similar to those later appearing in the* Book of Parables *(which was eventually incorporated into* 1 Enoch*) – rather than representing the mystic expressions of an actual historical figure or Qumran author.*

PROPHESIZED HISTORY OF THE POSTEXILIC PERIOD AND POLEMICS AGAINST PRIESTS IN 4Q390 FROM QUMRAN: LEVITE AUTHORSHIP BEHIND THE FRAGMENTS?[1]

BALÁZS TAMÁSI, *Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Hungary*

Introduction

In this paper I intend to examine the text 4Q390 that has been interpreted in various ways in the scholarship, for example, as a part of the Apochryphon of Jeremiah, published (in 2000) together with Pseudo-Ezekiel (4Q383, 4Q 385-390).[2] Both special views of the postexilic history and (as part of it) a heavy polemic against the contemporary priesthood are characteristics of the well-preserved fragments of 4Q390 (frgs. 1, 2 i).[3] Following these aspects of the text I would complete the conclusions having prevailed in the scholarship up to now. I take into consideration certain texts from Qumran and Pseudepigrapha, which reflect differently how the postexilic history was seen in 4Q390. Based on evidences appearing in the course of this analysis I shall suppose the existence of a Levite-oriented author behind the text.

Before the analysis, it is worth giving a broad outline of different viewpoints regarding the placement of 4Q390 amongst the other fragments. Dimant, after receiving the official editorship of the fragments from Strugnell, modified her standpoint during the process of publication. Although she always insisted to her opinion regarding multiple authorship behind the texts she abandoned her earlier argument for a Pseudo-Moses,

[1] This is a condensed and slightly modified version of a paper I published in *With Wisdom as a Robe. Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich* (ed. K.D. Dobos and M. Köszeghy; Hebrew Bible Monographs, 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), pp. 310-328.

[2] The 4Q383, 4Q385-4Q390 are published in D. Dimant (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4. XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, (DJD 30, Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), further on DJD 30. 4Q384 and 4Q391 were published by M. Smith (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4. XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, (J.C VanderKam, consulting ed.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), pp.137-193. To the preliminary edition of 4Q390 see D. Dimant, "New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha – 4Q390," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991* (ed. J Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ, 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), pp. 405-447 (pp. 414-415). From 4Q390 parts were quoted by J.T. Milik, *The Book of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), p. 255.

[3] These were recently published in *DJD, 30*, pp. 235-251. The tiny and badly preserved fragments of 4Q390 are not under examination in this paper.